APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,674	10/30/2001	Jay S. Dweck	G08.010	4007

			EXAMINER
28062 7590 12/19/2003			CHOJNACKI, MELLISSA M

BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF, TALWALKAR LLC
5 ELM STREET
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/016,674	DWECK ET AL.	
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Mellissa M Chojnacki	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-37_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-37_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _4-5_ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-4, 9, 12, 18-19, 22, 24-25, 31 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over, LaMarca et al. (U.S. Patent 6,266,682), in view of

Shirley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,739).

As to claim 1, LaMarca et al. teaches a method of facilitating access to

documents (See Abstract, where "retrieves documents" is read on "facilitating access to

documents"; also see column 7, lines 41-44), comprising:

assigning a first document tag to a document (See column 7, lines 44-45; column

15, lines 18-19).

LaMarca et al. does not teach automatically determining an associated tag for

the document based on the first document tag.

Shirley et al. teaches a system that accesses a knowledge base by markup

language tags (See Abstract), in which he teaches automatically determining an

associated tag for the document based on the first document tag (See column 3, lines

15-23, where the "markup language tag" is read on "first document tag" and "query tag" is read on "associated tag").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. to include automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on the first document tag.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. by the teachings of Shirley et al. because automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on the first document tag would be advantageous because by relating documents based on content with multiple unique tags, a document management systems can then easily identify and retrieve more related documents relevant to a user witch otherwise would possibly not be identified and retrieve based on just one tag.

As to claims 2, 4 and 24-25 LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein the document comprises content to be provided to a content reader via a communication network (See LaMarca et al., column 1, lines 45-51; where "user" is read on "content reader"; and see Shirley et al., column 4, lines 12-20, where "user" is read on "content reader");

wherein the communication network comprises at least one of: (i) the Internet, (ii) an intranet, (iii) a public network, (iv) a public switched telephone network, (v) a

proprietary network, (v) a wireless network, and (vi) a local area network (See LaMarca

et al., column 1, lines 44-47; also see Shirley et al., column 4, lines 12-23);

transmitting the retrieved document to a content reader via a communication

network (See LaMarca et al., column 1, lines 44-47 where "user" is read on "content

reader"; and also see Shirley et al., column 4, lines 12-20, where "user" is read on

"content reader");

wherein said transmitting is performed via at least one of: (i) a content controller.

(ii) a content reader, (iii) a personal computer, (iv) a server, (v) a portable computing

device, (vi) a telephone, (vii) a Web site, and (viii) an electronic mail message (See

LaMarca et al., column 1, lines 42-47).

As to claim 3, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein the content comprises

at least one of: (i) text information, (ii) image information, (iii) audio information, and (iv)

executable information (See LaMarca et al., column 11, lines 12-19; also see Shirley et

al., column 1, lines 24-32, where "elements" is read on "content").

As to claim 9, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein at least one tag is

associated with at least one of: (i) an author, (ii) a date, and (iii) an information type

(See LaMarca et al., column 10, lines 22-27, where "properties" is read on "tags"; also

see Shirley et al., column 4, lines 44-50).

As to claim 12, <u>LaMarca et al.</u> as modified, teaches wherein the document comprises content to be provided to a content reader (See <u>LaMarca et al.</u>, column 8, lines 20-23, where "user" is read on "content reader"), and said assigning is automatically performed based on the content (See <u>LaMarca et al.</u>, column 7, lines 44-45; column 8, lines 65-67; column 9, lines 46-50).

As to claim 18, <u>LaMarca et al.</u> as modified, teaches assigning a second document tag to the document based on the associated tag (See <u>Shirley et al.</u>, column 3, lines 15-23, where the "markup language tag" for each document also has a associated "query tag").

As to claim 19, <u>LaMarca et al.</u> as modified, teaches wherein said assigning of the second document tag (See <u>LaMarca et al.</u>, column 15, lines 21-23) comprises:
transmitting an indication of the associated tag to a content publisher (See <u>LaMarca et al.</u>, column 10, lines 34-40, where "DMS" is read on "content publisher" and where "call" is read on "transmitting"; also see <u>Shirley et al.</u>, column 3, lines 15-23, where "knowledge base" is read on "content publisher");
receiving an indication from the content publisher (See <u>LaMarca et al.</u>, column 10, lines 42-44. It is inherent that when document results are given that they are received from document management system, which in turn receives the document from a content publisher. Also see <u>Shirley et al.</u>, column 3, lines 15-23, where "knowledge base" is read on "content publisher"); and

assigning a second document tag to the document based on the associated tag and the

received indication (See <u>Shirley et al.</u>, column 3, lines 15-23, where the "markup

language tag" for each document also has a associated "query tag").

As to claim 22, <u>LaMarca et al.</u> as modified, teaches retrieving the document in

accordance with at least one of: (i) the first document tag, and (ii) a second document

tag (See column 7, lines 41-56; column 15, lines 13-30).

As to claim 31, <u>LaMarca et al.</u> teaches a method of facilitating access to

documents (See Abstract; also see column 7, lines 41-44), comprising:

creating a document (See column 3, lines 21-23):

transmitting the document to a content controller along with an indication of a

first document tag (See column 3, lines 3-12, where "DMA" is read on "content

controller" and "properties" is read on "first document tag").

<u>LaMarca et al.</u> does not teach receiving an associated tag from the content

controller; and transmitting to the content controller an indication of whether or not a

second document tag should be assigned to the document based on the associated tag.

<u>Shirley et al.</u> teaches receiving an associated tag from the content controller (See

column 3, lines 15-23, where "knowledge base" is read on "content controller"); and

transmitting to the content controller an indication of whether or not a second

document tag should be assigned to the document based on the associated tag (See

column 3, lines 15-23, where the "markup language tag" for each document also has a associated "query tag").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. to include receiving an associated tag from the content controller; and transmitting to the content controller an indication of whether or not a second document tag should be assigned to the document based on the associated tag.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. by the teachings of Shirley et al. because receiving an associated tag from the content controller; and transmitting to the content controller an indication of whether or not a second document tag should be assigned to the document based on the associated tag would be advantageous because by relating documents based on content with multiple unique tags, a document management systems can then easily identify and retrieve more related documents relevant to a user witch otherwise would possibly not be identified and retrieve based on just one tag.

As to claim 36, LaMarca et al. teaches a method of facilitating access to documents (See Abstract; also see column 7, lines 41-44), comprising:

assigning a primary document tag to a document (See column 7, lines 44-45, where "first" is read on "primary"; also see column 15, lines 18-19).

LaMarca et al. does not teach assigning a secondary document tag to a document.

Shirley et al. teaches assigning a secondary document tag to a document (See column 3, lines 15-23, where the "markup language tag" for each document also has a associated "query tag").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. to include assigning a secondary document tag to a document.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. by the teachings of Shirley et al. because assigning a secondary document tag to a document would be advantageous because by relating documents based on content with multiple unique tags, a document management systems can then easily identify and retrieve more related documents relevant to a user witch otherwise would possibly not be identified and retrieve based on just one tag.

As to claim 37 LaMarca et al. teaches a method of facilitating access to documents (See Abstract, where "access" is read on "retrieves"), comprising:

assigning a first document tag to a document (See column 7, lines 44-45; column 15, lines 18-19).

LaMarca et al. does not teach automatically assigning a second document tag to the document based on the first document tag.

Shirley et al. teaches automatically assigning a second document tag to the document based on the first document tag (See column 3, lines 15-23, where the "markup language tag" for each document also has a associated "query tag").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. to include automatically assigning a second document tag to the document based on the first document tag.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. by the teachings of Shirley et al. because automatically assigning a second document tag to the document based on the first document tag would be advantageous because by relating documents based on content with multiple unique tags, a document management systems can then easily identify and retrieve more related documents relevant to a user witch otherwise would possibly not be identified and retrieve based on just one tag.

3.   Claims 5-8, 10 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaMarca et al. (U.S. Patent 6,266,682), in view of Shirley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,739) as applied to claims 1-4, 9, 12, 18-19, 22, 24-25, 31 and 36-37 above, and further in view of Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,510,434).

As to claims 5 & 10, LaMarca et al. as modified, does not teach wherein the content comprises at least one of: (i) financial information, (ii) financial news, (iii) information about financial events, (iv) investment information, and (v) market information;

wherein at least one tag is associated with at least one of: (i) a sector, (ii) an industry, (iii) a research type, (iv) a company, (v) an issuer, (vi) a region, (vii) a country, (viii) an investment product, (ix) a security instrument, (x) a third party rating, (xi) a research analyst, (xii) a strategist, (xiii) an event type, (xiv) a subject, (xv) an investment style, (xvi) a market cap, (xvii) a document type, (xviii) an information value, and (xix) a currency.

Anderson et al. teaches system and method for retrieving information from a database using an index of XML tags and metafiles (See Abstract), where he teaches wherein the content comprises at least one of: (i) financial information, (ii) financial news, (iii) information about financial events, (iv) investment information, and (v) market information (See column 2, lines 41-43, where "categories" and "terms" are read on "(i) financial information, (ii) financial news, (iii) information about financial events, (iv) investment information, and (v) market information"; also see column 7, lines 40-67);

wherein at least one tag is associated with at least one of: (i) a sector, (ii) an industry, (iii) a research type, (iv) a company, (v) an issuer, (vi) a region, (vii) a country, (viii) an investment product, (ix) a security instrument, (x) a third party rating, (xi) a research analyst, (xii) a strategist, (xiii) an event type, (xiv) a subject, (xv) an investment style, (xvi) a market cap, (xvii) a document type, (xviii) an information value, and (xix) a

currency (See column 2, lines 41-43, where "categories" and "terms" are read on "(i) a sector, (ii) an industry, (iii) a research type, (iv) a company, (v) an issuer, (vi) a region, (vii) a country, (viii) an investment product, (ix) a security instrument, (x) a third party rating, (xi) a research analyst, (xii) a strategist, (xiii) an event type, (xiv) a subject, (xv) an investment style, (xvi) a market cap, (xvii) a document type, (xviii) an information value, and (xix) a currency"; also see column 7, lines 40-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, to include wherein the content comprises at least one of: (i) financial information, (ii) financial news, (iii) information about financial events, (iv) investment information, and (v) market information; wherein at least one tag is associated with at least one of: (i) a sector, (ii) an industry, (iii) a research type, (iv) a company, (v) an issuer, (vi) a region, (vii) a country, (viii) an investment product, (ix) a security instrument, (x) a third party rating, (xi) a research analyst, (xii) a strategist, (xiii) an event type, (xiv) a subject, (xv) an investment style, (xvi) a market cap, (xvii) a document type, (xviii) an information value, and (xix) a currency.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, by the teachings of Anderson et al. because wherein the content comprises at least one of: (i) financial information, (ii) financial news, (iii) information about financial events, (iv) investment information, and (v) market information; wherein at least one tag is associated with at least one of: (i) a sector, (ii) an industry, (iii) a research type, (iv) a company, (v) an

issuer, (vi) a region, (vii) a country, (viii) an investment product, (ix) a security

instrument, (x) a third party rating, (xi) a research analyst, (xii) a strategist, (xiii) an event

type, (xiv) a subject, (xv) an investment style, (xvi) a market cap, (xvii) a document type,

(xviii) an information value, and (xix) a currency would located and categorize relevant

information accordingly and associated tags quicker and more efficiently for a more

precise document retrieval.

As to claims 6-8, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein at least one tag is

associated with at least one tag domain (See Anderson et al., column 4, lines 34-37);

wherein at least one tag domain comprises a single rooted, hierarchical data

structure (See LaMarca et al., Abstract; column 10, lines 22-26; also see Anderson et

al., column 9, lines 5-14);

wherein at least one tag domain comprises a multi-level domain, and at least one

domain level comprises a plurality of tags (See Anderson et al., column 15, lines 41-42;

column 16, lines 54-58).

As to claim 13, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein the first document

tag comprises at least one of: (i) a primary tag, and (ii) a secondary tag (See Anderson

et al., column 15, lines 62-63, where "first domain tag" reads on "primary tag".

As to claim 14, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein a plurality of

document tags are assigned to the document (See Anderson et al., column 15, lines

41-42, where "plurality of XML tags" is read on "plurality of document tags"; lines 53-55,

where "record" is read on "document").

4.   Claims 11, 15, 17, 20-21, 23, 26-27, 29-30 and 32-35 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaMarca et al. (U.S. Patent 6,266,682), in

view of Shirley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,739) as applied to claims 1-4, 9, 12, 18-19,

22, 24-25, 31 and 36-37 above, and further in view of Goldberg et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,598,046).

As to claim 11, LaMarca et al. as modified, does not teach wherein said

assigning is manually performed by at least one of: (i) a content publisher, and (ii) a tag

assignor.

Goldberg et al. teaches system and method for retrieving documents responsive

to a given user's role and scenario (See Abstract), where he teaches wherein said

assigning is manually performed by at least one of: (i) a content publisher, and (ii) a tag

assignor (See column 9, lines 49-54, where "author" is read on "content publisher").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, to

include, wherein said assigning is manually performed by at least one of: (i) a content

publisher, and (ii) a tag assignor.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, by the teachings

of Goldberg et al. because wherein said assigning is manually performed by at least one of: (i) a content publisher, and (ii) a tag assignor would help to make a document search and retrieval successful if the author or another assignee specify the document tags because by increasing the number of ways through which the document space can be navigated, the opportunity that the user's mental model and the navigation model will converge improves (See Goldberg et al., column 3, lines 25-29).

As to claims 15 and 17 LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches determining the associated tag in accordance with a pre-determined tag association (See Goldberg et al., column 9, lines 49-61, where "author-assigned tags" is read on "associated tag" and "utility to automatically assign tags" reads on "pre-determined tag association");

further comprising: automatically generating the pre-determined tag association (See Goldberg et al., column 9, lines 49-61, where "utility to automatically assign tags" reads on "pre-determined tag association").

As to claims 20-21, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches further comprising: receiving the document from a content publisher (See Goldberg et al., column 9, lines 49-66, where "author" is read on "content publisher");

wherein documents are received from a plurality of content publishers (See Goldberg et al., column 9, lines 49-66, where "author" is read on "content publisher". It is inherent that a "mix of documents" has to have a "plurality of content publishers").

As to claims 23, <u>LaMarca et al.</u> as modified, teaches wherein the document is retrieved further in accordance with at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (ii) a request tag, and (iii) an entitlement tag (See <u>Goldberg et al.</u>, column 15, lines 17-19, where "user tag" is read on "request tag").

As to claim 26, <u>LaMarca et al.</u>, teaches receiving an indication of a first document tag from the content publisher (See column 2, lines 53-55; See column 7, lines 44-45; column 15, lines 18-19), wherein the first document tag is associated with a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure (See Abstract; column 2, lines 24-30, lines 31-32, where "properties" is read on "tag").

<u>LaMarca et al.</u>, does not teach automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on the first document tag; transmitting an indication of the associated tag to the content publisher; receiving an indication from the content publisher; assigning a second document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received indication; transmitting the retrieved investment research document to a content reader via a communication network.

<u>Shirley et al.</u> teaches automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on the first document tag (See column 3, lines 15-23, where the "markup language tag" is read on "first document tag" and "query tag" is read on "associated tag"); transmitting an indication of the associated tag to the content publisher (See column 3, lines 15-23, where "knowledge base" is read on "content publisher"); receiving an indication from the content publisher (See column 3, lines 15-

23, where "knowledge base" is read on "content publisher"); assigning a second

document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and

the received indication (See column 3, lines 15-23, where the "markup language tag" for

each document also has a associated "query tag"); transmitting the retrieved

investment research document to a content reader via a communication network (See

column 4, lines 12-20, where "user" is read on "content reader").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. to include

automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on the first

document tag; transmitting an indication of the associated tag to the content publisher;

receiving an indication from the content publisher; assigning a second document tag to

the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received

indication; transmitting the retrieved investment research document to a content reader

via a communication network.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. by the teachings of Shirley et

al. because automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on the

first document tag; transmitting an indication of the associated tag to the content

publisher; receiving an indication from the content publisher; assigning a second

document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and

the received indication; transmitting the retrieved investment research document to a

content reader via a communication network would prevent the document to possibly

not be identified and retrieve based only by just one tag.

LaMarca et al. as modified, does not teach a computer-implemented method of

facilitating access to investment research documents, comprising:

receiving an investment research document from a content publisher; retrieving

the investment research document in accordance with the second document tag and at

least one of: (i) a reader tag, (ii) a request tag, and (iii) an entitlement tag.

Goldberg et al. teaches a computer-implemented method of facilitating access to

investment research documents (See Abstract. It is inherent that the "document retrieval

and navigational system" is a "computer-implemented" method. Also see column 7,

lines 25-32, where "financial services" is read on "investment research documents"),

comprising:

receiving an investment research document from a content publisher (See

column 9, lines 49-54; where "documents" is read on "investment research document".

It is inherent that documents have authors that write them.);

retrieving the investment research document in accordance with the second

document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (ii) a request tag, and (iii) an

entitlement tag (See Goldberg et al., column 7, lines 25-32, where "financial services" is

read on "investment research documents"; also see column 15, lines 17-19, where "user

tag" is read on "request tag"); and

. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, to

include, a computer-implemented method of facilitating access to investment research documents, comprising:

receiving an investment research document from a content publisher;

retrieving the investment research document in accordance with the second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (ii) a request tag, and (iii) an entitlement tag.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, by the teachings of Goldberg et al. because a computer-implemented method of facilitating access to investment research documents, comprising:

receiving an investment research document from a content publisher;

retrieving the investment research document in accordance with the second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (ii) a request tag, and (iii) an entitlement tag, would help to make a document search and retrieval successful if the author or another assignee specify the document tags because by increasing the number of ways through which the document space can be navigated, the opportunity that the user's mental model and the navigation model will converge improves (See Goldberg et al., column 3, lines 25-29).

As to claim 27, LaMarca et al. teaches an apparatus (See Abstract, where "system" is read on "apparatus"), comprising:

assign a first document tag to a document (See column 7, lines 44-45; column 15, lines 18-19).

LaMarca et al., does not teach assign a first document tag to a document, and automatically determine an associated tag for the document based on the first document tag.

Shirley et al. teaches assign a first document tag to a document, and automatically determine an associated tag for the document based on the first document tag (See column 3, lines 15-23, where the "markup language tag" for each document also has a associated "query tag").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. to include assign a first document tag to a document, and automatically determine an associated tag for the document based on the first document tag.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. by the teachings of Shirley et al. because to assign a first document tag to a document, and automatically determine an associated tag for the document based on the first document tag would prevent the document to possibly not be identified and retrieve based only by just one tag.

LaMarca et al. as modified, does not teach a processor; and a storage device in communication with said processor and storing instructions adapted to be executed by said processor.

Goldberg et al. teaches a processor (See column 4, lines 7-9, lines 11-14); and

a storage device in communication with said processor and storing instructions adapted to be executed by said processor to (See column 5, lines 34-37, where "repository" is read on "storage device").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, to include a processor; and a storage device in communication with said processor and storing instructions adapted to be executed by said processor.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, by the teachings of Goldberg et al. because a processor; and a storage device in communication with said processor and storing instructions adapted to be executed by said processor would generate a results output of documents which corresponds to the matched documents and sends them to an output device for presentation to the user (See Goldberg et al., column 4, lines 14-17).

As to claim 29, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches a communication device coupled to said processor and adapted to communicate with at least one of: (i) a content publisher, (ii) a document storage device, (iii) a content controller, (iv) a content reader, and (v) a payment service (See Goldberg et al., column 5, lines 34-37, where "repository" is read on "a document storage device").

As to claim 30, <u>LaMarca et al.</u> teaches assigning a first document tag to a document (See column 7, lines 44-45; column 15, lines 18-19).

<u>LaMarca et al.</u> does not teach automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on the first document tag.

<u>Shirley et al.</u> teaches automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on the first document tag (See column 3, lines 15-23, where the "markup language tag" for each document also has a associated "query tag").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified <u>LaMarca et al.</u> to include automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on the first document tag.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified <u>LaMarca et al.</u> by the teachings of <u>Shirley et al.</u> because automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on the first document tag would prevent the document to possibly not be identified and retrieve based only by just one tag.

<u>LaMarca et al.</u> as modified, does not teach a medium storing instructions adapted to be executed by a processor to perform a method of facilitating access to documents.

<u>Goldberg et al.</u> teaches a medium storing instructions adapted to be executed by a processor to perform a method of facilitating access to documents (See column 10, lines 19-27, where "repository" is read on "a medium storing instructions").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified <u>LaMarca et al.</u> as modified, to include a medium storing instructions adapted to be executed by a processor to perform a method of facilitating access to documents.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified <u>LaMarca et al.</u> as modified, by the teachings of <u>Goldberg et al.</u> because a medium storing instructions adapted to be executed by a processor to perform a method of facilitating access to documents would generate a results output of documents which corresponds to the matched documents and sends them to an output device for presentation to the user (See <u>Goldberg et al.</u>, column 4, lines 14-17).

As to claim 32, <u>LaMarca et al.</u> teaches a method of facilitating access to documents (See Abstract; also see column 7, lines 41-44), comprising:

retrieving a first document tag for a document (See column 16, lines 31-35, where "path tag" is read on "first document tag"); and

<u>LaMarca et al.</u> does not teach receiving a pre-determined tag association; determining an associated tag for the document based on the pre-determined tag association and the first document tag.

<u>Goldberg et al.</u> teaches receiving a pre-determined tag association (See Abstract; column 3, lines 6-8);

determining an associated tag for the document based on the pre-determined tag association and the first document tag (See column 9, lines 40-61, where "automatically-assigned tags" is read on "pre-determined tag" and "repository administrator-assigned tags" is read on "first document tag" and "author-assigned tags" is read on "associated tag").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. to include receiving a pre-determined tag association; determining an associated tag for the document based on the pre-determined tag association and the first document tag. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. by the teachings of Goldberg et al. because receiving a pre-determined tag association; determining an associated tag for the document based on the pre-determined tag association and the first document tag would be advantageous because by relating documents based on content with multiple unique tags, a document management systems can then easily identify and retrieve more related documents relevant to a user witch otherwise would not be identified and retrieve based on just one tag.

As to claim 33, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein said retrieving and determining are performed for a plurality of legacy documents (See LaMarca et al, Abstract; column 1, lines 36-45. It is inherent that typically "document management

systems" pertain to many applications/documents that many companies have invested much time and money into them).

As to claim 34, <u>LaMarca et al.</u> as modified, teaches wherein said retrieving the first document tag is further associated with at least one of: (i) tag translation, and (ii) content evaluation (See <u>LaMarca et al.,</u> column 9, lines 18-24; column 15, lines 34-35, where "document identifier" is read on "content evaluation" and "path tag" is read on "first document tag").

As to claim 35, <u>LaMarca et al.</u> as modified, teaches wherein the received pre-determined tag association comprises an adjusted tag association (See <u>Goldberg et al.</u>, column 9, lines 49-61, where "utility to automatically assign tags" reads on "pre-determined tag association").

5.   Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>LaMarca et al.</u> (U.S. Patent 6,266,682), in view of <u>Shirley et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,739) in further view of <u>Goldberg et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,598,046) as applied to claims 11, 15, 17, 20-21, 23, 26-27, 29-30 and 32-35 above, and further in view of <u>Anderson et al.</u> (U.S. Patent 6,510,434).

As to claim 28, <u>LaMarca et al.</u> as modified, does not teach wherein said storage device further stores at least one of: (i) a tag database, (ii) a document database, and (iii) a tag association database.

<u>Anderson et al.</u> system and method for retrieving information from a database using an index of XML tags and metafiles (See Abstract), where he teaches wherein said storage device further stores at least one of: (i) a tag database, (ii) a document database, and (iii) a tag association database (See column 2, lines 36-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified <u>LaMarca et al.</u> as modified, to include wherein said storage device further stores at least one of: (i) a tag database, (ii) a document database, and (iii) a tag association database.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified <u>LaMarca et al.</u> as modified, by the teachings of <u>Anderson et al.</u> because wherein said storage device further stores at least one of: (i) a tag database, (ii) a document database, and (iii) a tag association database would located and categorize relevant information accordingly and associated tags quicker and more efficiently for a more precise document retrieval.

6.   Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>LaMarca et al.</u> (U.S. Patent 6,266,682), in view of <u>Shirley et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,739), further in view of <u>Goldberg et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,598,046) as applied to claims 11,

15, 17, 20-21, 23, 26-27, 29-30 and 32-35 above, and further in view of Christensen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,543).

As to claim 16, LaMarca et al. as modified, does not teach wherein the pre-determined tag association is associated with at least one of: (i) a start date, (ii) an end date, (iii) antecedent tags. (iv) descendant tags, and (v) sibling tags.

Christensen et al. teaches file wrapper containing cataloging information for content searching across multiple platforms (See Abstract), wherein the pre-determined tag association is associated with at least one of: (i) a start date, (ii) an end date, (iii) antecedent tags. (iv) descendant tags, and (v) sibling tags (See column 7, lines 31-32, where "'date' tag" is read on "a start date" or "an end date"; also see column 11, lines).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, to include, wherein the pre-determined tag association is associated with at least one of: (i) a start date, (ii) an end date, (iii) antecedent tags. (iv) descendant tags, and (v) sibling tags.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, by the teachings of Christensen et al. because wherein the pre-determined tag association is associated with at least one of: (i) a start date, (ii) an end date, (iii) antecedent tags. (iv) descendant tags, and (v) sibling tags would locate and categorize relevant information accordingly and associated tags quicker and more efficiently for a more precise document retrieval.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to

the Systems and methods for facilitating access to documents via associated tags in

general:

U.S. Patent No. 5,408,655 to Oren et al., for disclosing user interface system and

method for traversing a database.

U.S. Patent No. 6,356,903 to Baxter et al., for disclosing a content management

system .

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Mellissa M. Chojnacki whose telephone number is 730-

305-8769. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-

3900.

Mmc
8-December-2003

DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100